Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/709,374
Docket No.: 10657-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

Claims 2-5, 8, 9, and 12-14 are withdrawn and claims 1, 6, 7, 10 and 11 are pending. The Office Action rejected all presently-pending claims 1, 6, 7, 10 and 11. Specifically, the Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. (U.S. 6,801,283) in view of Song (US 20010050744). The Office Action also rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. and Song et al. in view of Kanno et al. (US 2003/0016325). The Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. and Kanno et al. in view of Shimoshikiryou et al. (US 2002/0033923). The Office Action rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. and Kanno et al. in view of Itakura et al. (US 2003/0122991). The Office Action rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Koyama et al., Kanno et al. and Shimoshikiryou et al. in view of Itakura et al.. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, and reconsideration of all presently-pending claims 1, 6, 7, 10 and 11 is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

The Office Action also rejected claim 1 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. (U.S. 6,801,283) in view of Song et al. (US 20010050744); the Office action

rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. (U.S. 6,801,283) and Song et al. (US 20010050744) in view of Kanno et al. (US 2003/0016325); the Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. (U.S. 6,801,283) and Kanno et al. (US 2003/0016325) in view of Shimoshikiryou et al. (US 2002/0033923); the Office Action rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. (U.S. 6,801,283) and Kanno et al. (US 2003/0016325) in view of Itakura et al. (US 2003/0122991); and the Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. (U.S. 6,801,283), Kanno et al. (US 2003/0016325) and Shimoshikiryou et al. (US 2002/0033923) in view of Itakura et al. (US 2003/0122991). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons that not every element of the claim was taught or suggested by cited references such that the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

More particularly, the present invention teaches, among other things, "*...the optical compensation circular analyzer set comprising an analyzer plate, wherein the absorption axis of the analyzer plate is perpendicular to the absorption axis of the polarizer plate, and the polarizer plate form an included angle of between 40° to 50° with the alignment direction of the liquid crystal panel...*".

Contrary to the Office's assertion, Konno does not teach the polarizer plate form an included angle of between 40° to 50° with the alignment direction of the liquid crystal panel. Instead, as clearly illustrated in Figure 3 or 5 of Konno, the absorption axis of the analyzer plate

(406 or 407 in Figure 5, for example) is either perpendicular to or parallel to the alignment direction of the liquid crystal layer 401. There is no where in the specification that teaches the abovementioned features of the instant case. Therefore, even if these references were combined, the combination still fails to render the claim 1 unpatentable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Further, regarding to the rejections to claim 11 by Itakura, Itakura teaches the (nx-nz)/(nx-ny)>8. The present invention teaches that 4>(nx-nz)/(nx-ny)>2, which means (nx-nz)/(nx-ny) is greater than 2, but is less than 4. Therefore, (nx-nz)/(nx-ny) of the instant case can not be greater than 8 as taught by Itakura.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all presently pending claims 1, 6, 7, 10 and 11 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/709,374
Docket No.: 10657-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1, 6, 7, 10 and 11 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date : June 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw